

REMARKS

Claims 6-19 and 23 are presently pending. Claims 6-19 stand rejected. Claim 23 is added. Claims 1-5, and 20-22 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable from Steudel (U.S. Patent 4,156,253) in view of Hannah (US Patent 7,146,506).

Claim 6 recites, among other limitations, "shortening a blanking period in the data to accommodate auxiliary data, without dropping any of the video frames". The Office Action indicates that Steudel does not teach "shortening the blanking period itself".

However, the Office Action indicates that Hannah describes "shortening the blanking period (col. 4, lines 9-20 & col. 7 lines 30-31, reduced blanking interval)."

Col. 4, lines 9-20 generally describes the slots in the platform. It is unclear how this teaches "shortening a blanking period". It is believed that Examiner meant to cite another portion. Col. 7, lines 30-31 recites, "wherein the first TDMS link is to transmit reduced blanking interval data."

Hannah teaches that "In high definition television pixel formats, a reduced blanking interval may be utilized with a single link." Col. 3, Lines 19-20. However, the foregoing usage of the term "reduced blanking interval" is in comparison to other standards. The term "reduced" is used as an adjective to describe the blanking interval of some high definition television pixel formats *as compared to* other formats. Assignee respectfully submits that the foregoing also follows for col. 7, lines 30-31. Therefore, the blanking interval remains the same for the particular high definition television pixel format. In contrast, claim 6 recites, "shortening a blanking period", using the verb form of "shortening".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 6 and 23, as well as the dependent claims.

Regarding claim 23, reciting among other limitations, "shortening a vertical blanking period". The Office Action indicates the Stuedel does not teach using a

vertical blanking period. However, the Office Action indicates that Martin teaches a "vertical blanking period".

However, Steudel teaches that "if a bandwidth of 15kHz per sound channel is required, two sound channels can be transmitted. In the case of the 625 line standard, the sound signals are advantageously sampled at twice the line frequency 2fH, i.e., at $2 \times 15.625 \text{ KHz} = 31.25 \text{ KHz}$, for example." The foregoing teaches away from the combination with Martin because using the vertical blanking interval would result in significantly lower sampling rate, for example, at 625 lines per frame, a sampling rate of 50 Hz. This rate would not be a suitable rate for sampling sound.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that Steudel teach away from Martin, and respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 23.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are allowable, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 13-0017 in the name of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

Date: November 6, 2010

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 W. Madison – 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone: (312) 775-8000
FAX: (312) 775-8100